DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 899 UD 016 766

TITLE ESEA Title I Annual Evaluation Report FY 1975.
INSTITUTION South Carolina State Dept. of Education, Columbia. Div. of Instruction.
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Dropout Prevention; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Learning Laboratories; Mathematics Instruction; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

In South Carolina 235,420 children were served by Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I programs. The Fiscal Year 1975 allocation tc South Carolina was 30,882,029 dollars. Reading activities were provided for 64 percent of Title I students, math programs for 48 percent, and dropout prevention activities for nine percent. The instructional activities offered were usually conducted in a learning center staffed by a certified teacher and aide. Local Educational Agencies reported that the problems encountered most frequently in administering Title I programs were; delay in announcement of allocation amounts, inadequate Title I funds, limitations imposed by federal and state regulations and guidelines, and, inability to obtain qualified staff. Test data reported by local districts were analyzed according to a norm-referenced evaluation model. Results showed that most students in programs on a twelve month testing cycle maintained the same level or regressed slightly, while those on a fall-spring testing cycle showed greater than expected gains. A total of 12,475 dropout-prone students were served in Title I programs. Of these, 5.7 percent dropped out, compared to an overall state dropout rate of 1.2 percent. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135899

ESEA TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FY 1975

Prepared by

The Office of Federal Programs
Sidney B. Cooper, Jr., Director
Garlin A. Hicks, Chief Supervisor, Allocations Section

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD016766

South Carolina Department of Education
Cyril B. Busbee, State Superintendent
Division of Instruction
Charlie G. Williams, Deputy Superintendent

Columbia, South Carolina
November, 1975

ABSTRACT

Participants

Title I served 135,420 children, representing 24% of all elementary students and 14% of all secondary students in South Carolina.

Funds

The FY 1975 allocation to South Carolina was $30,882,029. Of this allocation, $27,037,330 was budgeted during FY 1975 in approved project applications for local school districts. Seventy percent (70%) of the budgeted amount was spent for salaries, paying a total of 4,076 personnel in the winter and 631 in the summer. The largest single group of personnel was teacher aides, 2,124.

Program Description

Reading activities were provided for 64% of Title I students, math programs for 48%, and dropout prevention activities for 9%.

An estimated average of $10,891 per district was spent for pre-service and in-service; of this $3,133 came from Title I funds and the remainder from other sources. Twenty hours was the average total time each teacher participated in pre-service and in-service. Title I teachers had an average of ten hours paid planning time during the summer and 1.3 hours per week during the winter. The instructional activities offered typically were conducted in a learning center staffed by a certificated teacher and aide. Students were regularly scheduled to the center for less than five hours per week. The typical Title I teacher planned instruction independently of the regular teachers and used a commercially published curriculum package.

LEA's reported that the problems encountered most frequently in administering Title I programs were:

1. Delay in announcement of allocation amounts
2. Inadequate Title I funds
3. Limitations imposed by federal and state regulations and guidelines
4. Inability to obtain qualified staff

Needs Assessment

Data supplied by the Statewide Testing Program reveal clearly that the average grade equivalents of South Carolina students are below national norms at all grade levels tested. This fact is true for all students and Title I students. National percentile ranks indicate that the State's fourth graders perform somewhat more poorly than the students in the other three tested grades. Title I students in the seventh grade perform relatively somewhat better than those in the fourth, ninth and eleventh.

TABLE A-1

CTBS BATTERY TOTAL EXPECTED AND OBTAINED
MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENTS (SGE) AND NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS
FOR ALL STUDENTS AND TITLE I STUDENTS IN
GRADES 4, 7, 9 and 11 (OCTOBER 1974)

GRADE	EXPECTED SGE	EXPECTED PR	OBTAINED SGE (ALL)	OBTAINED PR (ALL)	OBTAINED SGE (TITLE I)	OBTAINED PR (TITLE I)
4	4.1	50	3.3	31	2.6	12
7	7.1	50	6.1	38	4.2	15
9	9.1	50	8.1	38	5.1	12
11	11.1	50	10.1	37	6.6	10

Results of Testing

Test data reported by local districts were computed by grade level, by testing date, and by the title of the test used. Data were analyzed according to a norm-referenced evaluation model. Expected post-test scores were computed and compared to obtained post-test scores for data resulting from the CAT and CTBS which were the two most widely used tests. Results, in general, showed that programs on a twelve month testing cycle maintained the same level or regressed slightly, while those on a fall-to-spring testing cycle showed greater than expected gains. Absolute gains, measured in scale scores, were

approximately the same for both groups. It has not been determined whether the two groups were actually different or whether the apparent difference in effectiveness is spurious. The difference could result from not conforming to testing dates that correspond to publisher's norming dates.

Dropouts

A total of 12,475 dropout-prone students were served in Title I programs. Of these, 5.7% dropped out, compared to an overall state dropout rate of 1.2%.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		ii
I.	BASIC STATISTICS	1
	TABLE 1-1 Unduplicated Count of the Number of Students Actually Participating in Title I Activities	2
	TABLE 1-2 Title I Participants and Expenditures for Reading, Math and Dropout Prevention Activities. Regular and Summer Term	3
	TABLE 1-3 Percentage of Total Expenditures	5
	TABLE 1-4 Total Number Personnel Employed by Title I Funds and Percentage by Special Classification	6
	TABLE 1-5 Total Number Personnel Employed by Title I Funds	7
II.	STATE AGENCY STAFF VISITS AND MONITORING PROCEDURES	8
III.	PROGRAM INFORMATION	9
	TABLE 3-1 FY 1975 Estimated Fund Expenditure and Number of Student Participants for Regular and Summer School by Instructional and Supportive Service Category (Title I Low Income Only - Duplicated Count)	11
	TABLE 3-2 Number of Districts Indicating Specific Problems Encountered when Initiating and Implementing a Title I Project	12
	TABLE 3-3 Types of Activities Reported in Title I Instructional Programs	13
	TABLE 3-4 Hours Per Week of Scheduled Title I Instruction Per Student	14
	TABLE 3-5 Pre-Service, In-Service and Planning Time for Title I Staffs	14

Page

TABLE 3-6 15
Criteria Used for Selecting Students for Title I Programs

IV. NEEDS ASSESSMENT 16

TABLE 4-1 19
National Percentile Ranks for Mean Grade Equivalents (SGE) for All Students and Title I Students in Grades 4, 7, 9 and 11 for Selected CTBS Subtests

V. EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS 20

TABLE 5-1 22
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Pre- and Post-test Scores, Gains and Expected Gains for Reading Subtest Grades 2-12

TABLE 5-2 23
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Pre- and Post-test Scores, Gains and Expected Gains for Math Subtest Grades 2-12

TABLE 5-3 24
California Achievement Test Pre- and Post-test Scores, Gains and Expected Gains for Reading Subtest Grades 2-12

TABLE 5-4 25
California Achievement Test Pre- and Post-test Scores, Gains and Expected Gains for Math Subtest Grades 2-12

TABLE 5-5 26
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills and California Achievement Test Grade Equivalents and National Percentile Ranks of Mean Title I Post-test Scores for Reading and Math for S. C. Grades 2-12

TABLE 5-6 27
Title I Dropout Prevention Programs

VI. COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT 28

TABLE 6-1 29
Membership of Parent Advisory Councils

TABLE 6-2 30
Activities on Which the Parent Advisory Councils Participated

VII. DISSEMINATION 31

TABLE 7-1 32
LEA Techniques Used in Dissemination of Information and Frequency of Use

		Page
VIII.	TEACHER - TEACHER AIDE TRAINING	33
IX.	COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS	34
X.	STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE EFFORTS	35

I. BASIC STATISTICS

A. Total number of operating LEA's in the State	92
B. Number of LEA's participating in Title I	
1. during the regular school term only	92
2. during both regular and summer terms	16
C. Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs	
1. enrolled in public schools	134,792
2. enrolled in nonpublic schools	628
D. Number of Title I cooperative projects	3
1. number of districts participating	35

The total number of children served by Title I began a steady decline after FY 1971. Apparently this decline ceased. The number of students enrolled in Title I programs for the past five years are shown below.

Year	Number of Title I children served
FY 1971	289,276
FY 1972	188,238
FY 1973	152,613
FY 1974	121,368
FY 1975	135,420

In keeping with the state philosophy which emphasizes preventive rather than remedial education, there are proportionally more students enrolled in Title I programs at the elementary than at the secondary level. See Table I-1 for enrollment data.

The number of pupils participating and the amount of Title I expenditures are presented in Table I-2 and Table I-3. It is evident that Title I efforts are concentrated on reading.

TABLE I-1

UNDUPLICATED COUNT OF THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS
ACTUALLY PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES

REGULAR TERM

NUMBER OF STUDENTS

GRADE LEVELS	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	PRIVATE SCHOOLS	TOTAL
Pre-School	4,882	209	5,091
1-3	31,615	150	31,765
4-6	38,975	102	39,077
7-9	26,345	80	26,425
10-12	13,936	72	14,008
Special Education	10,724	0	10,724
Other	3,374	0	3,374
TOTALS	129,851	613	130,464

SUMMER TERM

Pre-School	255	0	255
1-3	1,379	9	1,388
4-6	1,464	6	1,470
7-9	581	0	581
10-12	670	0	670
Special Education	153	0	153
Other	439	0	439
TOTALS	4,941	15	4,956

TABLE I-2

TITLE I PARTICIPANTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR READING, MATH AND DROPOUT PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

REGULAR TERM

GRADE LEVELS	TITLE I READING ACTIVITY	TITLE I MATH ACTIVITY	TITLE I DROPOUT PREVENTION ACTIVITY
Kindergarten	2,157	1,459	0
1-3	26,295	15,188	21
4-6	25,961	26,666	99
7-9	17,623	11,448	5,390
10-12	6,324	2,459	7,078
Private	874	273	0
Other	3,464	3,386	77
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS	82,698	60,879	12,665
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$10,520,032.24	$4,646,099.43	$1,226,396.42
AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE	127.21	76.31	96.83

SUMMER TERM

Kindergarten	224	224	0
1-3	1,388	1,027	0
4-6	1,531	1,395	0
7-9	361	385	26
10-12	180	177	8
Private	15	6	0
Other	442	302	20
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS	4,141	3,516	34
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 326,136.64	$ 201,093.64	$ 2,680
AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE	78.75	57.19	78.62

In Table I-3, data are given showing amounts of funds expended for instructional services, supportive services, and other services.

A breakdown of the number of employed personnel by classification for regular and summer terms is presented in Table I-4 and Table I-5. The largest group of employed personnel was teacher aides and the largest number of employed professional personnel was elementary teachers.

TABLE I-3

	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES					CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
INSTRUCTIONAL	FY 71	FY 72	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 71-75
Salaries, Teachers, Aides, Other	47.5	56.0	59.2	59.4	69.7	+ 22.2
Audio-visual Materials, Textbooks In-service Training, Travel, Equipment for Instruction	17.4	12.5	9.1	10.8	2.8	- 14.6
TOTAL	64.9	68.5	68.3	70.2	72.5	+ 7.6
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES						
Health, Medical, Dental, Psy.	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.1	- .5
Transportation, Food, Construction and Remodeling, Sites and Other Equipment	10.7	3.4	1.3	1.5	1.4	- 9.3
Other - Attendance, Student and Community	5.2	7.4	7.8	4.5	5.4	+ .2
TOTAL	20.5	15.4	13.7	10.9	10.9	- 9.6
OTHER SERVICES						
Administration, Operation and Maintenance	7.2	7.7	8.9	8.6	7.1	- .1
Fixed Charges	7.4	8.4	9.1	10.3	9.5	+ 2.1
TOTAL	14.6	16.1	18.0	18.9	16.6	+ 2.0

BUDGETED FUNDS	FY 71	FY 72	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75
Instructional Expenditures	21,144,539	22,547,023	19,274,191	14,421,433	19,590,423
Supportive Services	6,684,305	5,056,988	3,858,082	2,235,353	2,938,745
Other	4,259,750	5,292,130	5,078,429	3,880,844	4,508,162
TOTAL	32,088,594	32,896,141	28,210,702	20,537,630	27,037,330

TABLE I-4

TOTAL NUMBER PERSONNEL EMPLOYED BY TITLE I FUNDS
AND PERCENTAGE BY SPECIAL CLASSIFICATION

CLASSIFICATION	REGULAR TERM	SUMMER TERM	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL TITLE I STAFF
Teachers (all grade levels - all subjects)	1,274	282	1,556	33.06
Aides (include library aides)	1,980	180	2,160	45.89
Other Professionals (librarians, supervisors, counselors, evaluation specialists, administrators)	511	46	557	11.83
Support Staff (clerical, janitors, etc.)	311	123	434	9.22
TOTALS	4,076	631	4,707	100.00%

TABLE I-5

TOTAL NUMBER PERSONNEL EMPLOYED BY TITLE I FUNDS

FY 1975

CLASSIFICATION	REGULAR YEAR	SUMMER SCHOOL	TOTAL
Teachers - Pre-school	98	33	131
Teachers - Elementary	663	191	854
Teachers - Secondary	306	25	331
Teachers - Handicapped	207	33	240
Teacher Aides	1,948	176	2,124
Librarians	9	6	15
Library Aides	32	4	36
Supervisors/Adm.	236	39	275
Counselors/Psy.	54	1	55
Attendance/Soc. Wk.	99	0	99
Nurses	109	0	109
Other Medical	4	0	4
Clerical Personnel	146	24	170
Janitors	12	2	14
Bus Drivers	1	28	29
Other (Substitute Teachers & Eval.)	152	69	221
TOTALS	4,076	631	4,707

* Data used to compile this Table was taken from the Title I Progress Report which is developed by the State Title I Office from approved project applications.

II. STATE AGENCY STAFF VISITS AND MONITORING PROCEDURES

Each project in the state is scheduled for an on-site review by the Title I staff on a rotating two-year cycle. These reviews are one aspect of the total reviewing and monitoring process which begins with pre-submission of proposals in April. Pre-submission enables the Title I staff to schedule individual conferences with each of the ninety-two districts in the state. During these conferences, weaknesses in the proposals are identified and corrected, thereby minimizing last minute changes after the official submission date.

The Title I staff begins on-site program reviews in the fall. The major purpose of these on-site reviews is to ensure that program operations are being conducted in accordance with the specifications set forth in the approved project. If, during the initial review, it is determined that there is need for corrective action, the district is given thirty days to make changes. A follow-up review by the Title I staff is then made to validate that corrective action has been taken. If the Title I staff determines that corrective action has not been taken, funds may be terminated.

During fiscal year 1975, forty-eight initial on-site program reviews and thirty follow-up reviews were made. In addition, accountants from the Office of Finance conducted nine comparability reviews.

III. PROGRAM INFORMATION

The data reported in Table 3-1 indicate that more elementary and secondary schools conducted reading activities than any other activity in both regular and summer terms, and that mathematics programs also were emphasized. These data reflect the state's continuing emphasis upon basic skills programs.

LEA's reported various types of problems in implementing Title I programs. These reports are summarized in Table 3-2. As in the past, the most frequently cited problem has been the delay in announcement of allocation amounts.

In the past several years a great deal of emphasis has been placed on providing programs for children who have some major type of mental or physical handicap. Without Title I funds, many local districts would not have adequate funds to offer a sufficient number of classes for the number of children determined eligible.

Title I affords local school districts the opportunity to expand compensatory programs in eligible areas by providing supplementary materials and equipment and paying the local supplement for the teacher involved. Title I funds can be used only for additional classes above those classes which were offered by the LEA before the inception of Title I.

In fiscal year 1975, 10,724 special education students participated in Title I programs. This data, as compared with fiscal year 1974, in which 12,329 students participated shows a decrease in the number of children who receive benefits for these services. A large percentage of the cost for educating handicapped children is being absorbed by the local and state agencies.

Additional data describing Title I program activities were collected and are summarized in Tables 3-3 through 3-6. According to these reports, a typical Title I reading program is conducted in a learning center staffed by a certificated teacher and a full-time aide, to which students are assigned less than five hours a week, but on a regular schedule. Typically, students' daily lessons are planned independently by the Title I teacher who uses a commercially published curriculum package. Most students participating in Title I programs have been selected on the basis of at least two objective criteria, and the most frequently employed selection criterion is standardized test scores.

TABLE 3-1

FY 1975 ESTIMATED FUND EXPENDITURE AND NUMBER OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS FOR TITLE I REGULAR AND SUMMER SCHOOL BY INSTRUCTIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICE CATEGORY (DUPLICATED COUNT)

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	NUMBER OF STUDENTS Regular	Summer	ESTIMATED COST Regular	Summer
Art	-	-	-	-
Business Education	-	-	-	-
Cultural Enrichment	-	-	-	-
English-Reading	62,299	1,316	$7,671,635	$81,902
English-Speech	616	-	75,205	-
English-Other Lang.Arts	10,799	1,050	1,065,650	79,300
English-2nd Language	-	-	-	-
Foreign Language	-	-	-	-
Home Economics	-	-	-	-
Industrial Arts	135	-	12,280	-
Math	58,459	1,940	4,475,725	63,080
Music	2,387	-	14,745	-
Phy. Ed./Recreation	-	-	-	-
Natural Science	3,731	110	95,093	8,319
Social Science	-	70	-	8,078
Other Voc. Ed.	1,265	-	155,878	-
Special Activities for Handicapped	12,643	894	1,496,148	55,398
Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	4,568	16,750	948,426	28,580
Other Inst. Activities	21,971	3,523	2,123,440	342,878
TOTAL	178,873	25,653	$18,134,225	$667,535
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES				
Attendance	22,841	-	$291,886	-
Clothing	4,730	-	86,130	-
Food	275	960	3,440	$5,475
Guidance Counseling	11,191	120	202,168	960
Health-Dental	17,926	-	246,641	-
Health-Medical	55,267	50	755,400	500
Library	12,138	470	119,591	6,850
Psychological	11,356	-	288,466	-
Social Work	22,405	-	418,042	-
Speech Therapy	3,888	-	79,139	-
Transportation	3,567	3,363	53,991	73,347
Special Services for Handicapped	556	75	42,673	1,875
Other Services	41,763	350	292,240	933
TOTAL	207,903	5,388	$2,879,807	$89,940

Total of Regular School Expenditures for State $21,014,032
Total of Summer School Expenditures for State $ 757,475

TABLE 3-2

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS INDICATING SPECIFIC PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WHEN INITIATING AND IMPLEMENTING A TITLE I PROJECT*

FY 1975

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS **	NUMBER OF LEA'S ENCOUNTERING PROBLEM
Limitations imposed by Federal and state regulations and guidelines	35
Excessive paper work	28
Inadequate Title I funds	38
Delay of announcement of allocation amounts	53
Inadequate planning time	8
Lack of appropriate evaluation devices	12
Development of evaluation strategies	15
Inability to secure equipment, materials and supplies in time	26
Completion of evaluation report	13
Lack of school facilities or space for carrying out the project	22
Identification of pupil needs	1
Inability to obtain qualified staff	11
Completion of project applications	4
Delay of financial payments	15
Delay between submission and approval of project	16
Delay between submission and approval of amendments	4
Fiscal accounting procedures	3
Shortage of administrative staff to plan and supervise the project	8
Pre-service and/or in-service training of staff	8
Designing of projects to meet pupil needs	10
Other	1

* Data used to compile this Table was taken from Title I Annual Evaluation Reports.

** Eighteen districts reported encountering no problems in initiating and implementing their Title I projects.

TABLE 3-3

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES REPORTED IN TITLE I INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	
	READING	MATH
Organization		
Self-contained classroom	246	217
Learning center	347	197
Resource room	160	60
Other	132	78
Schedule		
Flexible schedule	205	133
Regularly scheduled hours/weeks	543	364
Planning of Students' Assignments		
Planned by supervisor	67	45
Planned by regular teacher	211	245
Planned by Title I teacher	465	207
Other	94	71
Curriculum Materials Used		
Locally developed	427	242
Commercially published package	486	316
Supplementary textbooks	273	98
Other	177	83
Instructional Staff		
Certificated staff only	129	53
Certificated staff and full-time aide	425	279
Certificated staff and part-time aide	137	104

TABLE 3-4

HOURS PER WEEK OF SCHEDULED TITLE I
INSTRUCTION PER STUDENT

HOURS PER DAY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	
	READING	MATH
Less than 1	311	244
1 to 1½	165	129
1½ to 2	115	39
More than 2	78	8
Flexible (variable) schedule	68	76

TABLE 3-5

PRE-SERVICE, IN-SERVICE AND PLANNING TIME
FOR TITLE I STAFFS

Teachers participating in pre-service or in-service	2,215
Title I expenditures for pre-service and in-service	$288,285
Expenditures from other sources for pre-service and in-service (estimated)	$713,750
Average hours each teacher participates in pre-service	6
Average hours each teacher participates in in-service	14
Average scheduled planning hours (summer)	10
Average scheduled planning hours per week during session	1.31

TABLE 3-6

CRITERIA USED FOR SELECTING STUDENTS FOR
TITLE I PROGRAMS

CRITERIA	SCHOOLS REPORTING	
	NUMBER	PERCENT
Standardized test scores only	11	1.9
Grades earned in school (achievement) only	0	0
Professional judgment (subjective) only	0	0
Free lurch program only	0	0
Other only	0	0
Standardized test scores and one additional criterion	219	37.4
Standardized test scores and two additional criteria	201	34.4
Standardized test scores and three or more additional criteria	145	24.8
Grades earned in school, no test scores but other criteria	9	1.5
TOTALS	585	100%

IV. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The South Carolina State Department of Education has adopted a five year plan to increase the educational quality of South Carolina schools. The plan has the following major objectives:

1. To reduce the number of dropouts by at least 50 percent by 1975.
2. To reduce the number of students repeating the first grade from the present 15 percent to a maximum of 5 percent by 1975.
3. To establish a statewide program of public kindergartens available to all 5-year-old children by 1975.
4. To measurably improve the basic verbal and quantitative skills of the inschool students by 1975.
5. To provide an adequate occupational training program for 100 percent of the secondary school students who choose it by 1975.
6. To increase the number of high school graduates entering post high school training to at least 50 percent by 1975.
7. To develop an adequate educational program for youth with physical, mental or emotional handicapping conditions by 1975.
8. To increase the total adult enrollment in basic and high school programs from the present 40,000 to at least 80,000 by 1975.
9. To promote programs to provide adequate and qualified professional and para-professional personnel to staff the state's educational system.
10. To incur the implementation of at least a defined minimum educational program in each local school district by 1975.
11. To develop and maintain a system of continuous evaluation and upgrading of education.

The State Board of Education has further mandated that districts in which a need for improving the basic skills areas or reduction of the dropout rate exists, Title I money must be

first directed toward reading, mathematics and dropout prevention programs. In order to implement the mandate, the Title I application includes a needs assessment package which is designed to solicit data related to the reading and mathematics achievement and dropout rate from each district. The data utilized for assessing district needs in the achievement areas is taken from the annual Statewide Testing Program. This procedure allows for consistency in the state and local needs assessment endeavors, and provides a consistent reference point for comparing achievement among districts.

The testing plan for October 1974 is summarized below.

Grade Level	Test(s) and Level	Sample
4	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form S, Level 1 and Short Form Test of Academic Aptitude, Level 2	All public school students and approximately 95% of Catholic school students except those enrolled in special education programs.
7	CTBS/S-2	All public school students and approximately 94% of Catholic school students except those enrolled in special education programs.
9	CTBS/S-3	10 percent stratified random sample
11	CTBS/S-4	10 percent stratified random sample

Each district receives total district, individual school, and individual pupil reports for both Title I participants and total school populations, and the Office of Federal Programs receives similar reports aggregated at the district and state levels.

Local Title I Coordinators utilize district and school reports for local needs assessments. If the reading scores of 35 percent or more of the students in a district's priority schools fall at or below the 25th percentile according to national norms, a reading program must be implemented by that district with Title I funds. A similar requirement is imposed for mathematics performance. If fewer than 35 percent of the students score below the 25th percentile in either or both of these instructional areas, a Title I program is not mandated for the area(s) for which this performance level occurs.

Data from the Statewide Testing Program, aggregated for the entire state, are presented in Table 4-1. The entries in this table are national percentile ranks corresponding to the average performance of "all" students and Title I students in the 4th, 7th, 9th and 11th grades in South Carolina. An examination of the data in this table reveals that South Carolina students tend to score relatively lower in mathematics and reading than in other areas. Further, 4th grade students are systematically scoring relatively more poorly than students in other grades.

The data show also that Title I students score relatively lower in mathematics and reading than in other areas. No consistent pattern, however, is evident to indicate that one grade tends to perform systematically below the others. Fourth graders are relatively lower in mathematics and science, while 11th graders are lower in reading, language and mathematics.

Since the Statewide Testing Program is conducted in the fall, several weeks after Title I students have begun their activities, these data also demonstrate that selection procedures are successfully identifying educationally deprived students for Title I participation.

TABLE 4-1

NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS FOR MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENTS (SGE)
FOR ALL STUDENTS AND TITLE I STUDENTS IN GRADES 4, 7, 9 and 11
FOR SELECTED CTBS SUBTESTS
(OCTOBER, 1974)

STUDENTS	GRADE	BATTERY TOTAL	READING TOTAL	LANGUAGE TOTAL	MATH TOTAL	REFERENCE SKILLS	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES
ALL	4	31	34	37	31	43	38	39
	7	38	40	40	34	47	47	44
	9	38	41	43	37	47	41	45
	11	37	40	44	36	47	44	47
TITLE I	4	12	14	17	12	19	16	21
	7	15	15	17	15	20	23	21
	9	12	15	17	15	22	19	19
	11	10	11	12	11	20	21	20

V. EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Evaluation of Achievement

Data reported in this section represent test scores that are compatible with a norm-referenced evaluation model. Aggregating the district test data at the state level is difficult at this time because of at least two constraints:

1. Pre-test to post-test time intervals vary and do not always conform to publisher's norming dates.
2. Non compatible evaluation models have been utilized.

Efforts are currently under way to ensure that the data will become increasingly aggregable. These efforts are consistent with the recommendations that are being made by RMC Research Corporation.

Reading total scores and math total scores from both the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) and the California Achievement Tests (CAT) were aggregated separately, by grade level, from the annual evaluation reports submitted to the State Department of Education from districts reporting both pre-test and post-test data. These tests were selected for analysis because they are the most widely used for program evaluation. The pre-test average scale scores were used to project the expected post-test score using the procedure recommended in a norm-referenced evaluation model (RMC Manual UR-243). Results are summarized in Tables 5-1 through 5-4. The data gleaned from fall-to-spring testing have been compiled separately from the spring-to-spring testing results.

The differences between actual post-test scores and expected post-test scores for fall-to-spring testing are, on the average, larger in a positive direction than corresponding differences for spring-to-spring

testing. Of the 18 fall reading differences, 4 are significant* and positive; of the 22 spring reading differences, 2 are significant* but one is positive and one is negative. Of the 14 fall math differences, 7 are significant* and positive; of the 21 spring math differences, none is significant*.

Because of certain known and assumed psychometric properties of test scores and test norms, and certain known and assumed characteristics of student achievement gains and losses, one would conclude that the spring-to-spring test data reported in Tables 5-1 to 5-4 are more reliable than the fall-to-spring data. The insignificant gains shown by the spring data are disappointing. Nevertheless, although individual district obtained and expected differences were not compiled, it is undoubtedly true that some districts' Title I students did exhibit significant gain while students in other districts did not.

The utilization of more systematic and compatible evaluation models, better data reporting procedures, and some analysis of relationships between gains and characteristics of program components may produce information which will result in more definitive conclusions. As was stated earlier in this report, efforts in these directions have been implemented and will continue.

* Significance is based on the difference being equal to or greater than one-third of the grade-level scale-score standard deviation of the national standardization sample.

TABLE 5-1

COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS
PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES, GAINS AND EXPECTED GAINS
FOR READING SUB-TEST - GRADES 2-12

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER STUDENTS	AVERAGE PRE-TEST SCALE SCORE	AVERAGE POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	OBSERVED GAIN	EXPECTED POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	ACTUAL POST-TEST MINUS EXPECTED POST-TEST
*Spring 2	586	211	249	38	257	- 8
**Fall 2	1859	222	285	63	243	+ 42 ***
Spring 3	1060	253	297	44	293	+ 4
Fall 3	1221	254	307	53	277	+ 30 ***
Spring 4	1298	306	334	28	342	- 8
Fall 4	3224	307	339	32	324	+ 15
Spring 5	1441	338	368	30	365	+ 3
Fall 5	2322	340	370	30	365	+ 5
Spring 6	1144	373	400	27	386	+ 14
Fall 6	1245	356	387	31	360	+ 27
Spring 7	1282	392	418	26	409	+ 9
Fall 7	2197	398	425	27	409	+ 16
Spring 8	1027	426	444	18	453	- 9
Fall 8	1342	418	441	23	438	+ 3
Spring 9	720	419	436	17	441	- 5
Fall 9	420	418	434	16	441	- 7
Spring 10	458	444	471	27	481	- 10
Fall 10	460	452	466	14	474	- 8
Spring 11	322	465	485	20	495	- 10
Fall 11	280	462	489	27	488	+ 1
Spring 12	286	486	511	25	516	- 5
Fall 12	113	499	526	27	516	+ 10

*Spring indicates that the pre-test was given in the spring of the preceding year. Twelve months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

**Fall indicates that the pre-test was given in the fall. About eight months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

***The difference is significant. Significance is based on the difference being equal to or greater than one-third of the grade-level scale-score standard deviation of the national standardization sample.

TABLE 5-2

COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS
PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES, GAINS AND EXPECTED GAINS
FOR MATH SUB-TESTS - GRADES 2-12

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER STUDENTS	AVERAGE PRE-TEST SCALE SCORE	AVERAGE POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	OBSERVED GAIN	EXPECTED POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	ACTUAL POST-TEST MINUS EXPECTED POST-TEST
*Spring 2	562	226	271	45	269	+ 2
**Fall 2	1410	237	283	46	258	+ 25 ***
Spring 3	985	257	295	38	298	- 3
Fall 3	1179	263	311	48	284	+ 27 ***
Spring 4	1141	296	332	36	322	+ 10
Fall 4	3069	309	343	34	322	+ 21 ***
Spring 5	1829	342	370	28	373	- 3
Fall 5	2526	341	373	32	357	+ 16
Spring 6	1578	363	391	28	376	+ 15
Fall 6	1261	363	390	27	369	+ 21
Spring 7	867	383	412	29	405	+ 7
Fall 7	2287	394	418	24	398	+ 20
Spring 8	601	398	416	18	422	- 6
Fall 8	1087	394	420	26	398	+ 22
Spring 9	446	427	445	18	459	- 14
Fall 9	439	437	451	14	444	+ 7
Spring 10	345	460	468	8	498	- 20
Fall 10	361	438	463	25	459	+ 4
Spring 11	120	472	484	12	492	- 8
Fall 11	132	459	469	10	473	- 4
Spring 12	99	468	485	17	486	- 1
Fall 12						

*Spring indicates that the pre-test was given in the spring of the preceding year. Twelve months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

**Fall indicates that the pre-test was given in the fall. About eight months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

***The difference is significant. Significance is based on the difference being equal to or greater than one-third of the grade-level scale-score standard deviation of the national standardization sample.

TABLE 5-3

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES, GAINS AND EXPECTED GAINS
FOR READING SUB-TEST - GRADES 2-12

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER STUDENTS	AVERAGE PRE-TEST SCALE SCORE	AVERAGE POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	OBSERVED GAIN	EXPECTED POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	ACTUAL POST-TEST MINUS EXPECTED POST-TEST	
*Spring 2	234	259	290	31	309	- 19	***
**Fall 2	900	254	294	40	282	+ 12	
Spring 3	249	284	319	35	323	- 4	
Fall 3	979	270	311	41	293	+ 18	
Spring 4	107	285	328	43	306	+ 22	***
Fall 4	139	310	344	34	325	+ 19	
Spring 5	119	317	356	39	349	+ 7	
Fall 5	175	334	384	50	359	+ 25	***
Spring 6	235	350	381	31	368	+ 13	
Fall 6	112	354	404	50	368	+ 36	***
Spring 7	209	363	386	23	388	- 2	
Fall 7	77	374	413	39	388	+ 25	
Spring 8	191	386	398	12	409	- 11	
Fall 8	117	422	457	35	437	+ 20	
Spring 9	142	384	402	18	409	- 7	
Fall 9							
Spring 10	95	424	451	27	465	- 14	
Fall 10							
Spring 11	72	442	467	25	465	+ 2	
Fall 11							
Spring 12	18	480	491	11	494	- 3	
Fall 12							

*Spring indicates that the pre-test was given in the spring of the preceding year. Twelve months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

**Fall indicates that the pre-test was given in the fall. About eight months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

***The difference is significant. Significance is based on the difference being equal to or greater than one-third of the grade-level scale-score standard deviation of the national standardization sample.

TABLE 5-4

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES, GAINS AND EXPECTED GAINS
FOR MATH SUB-TEST , GRADES 2-12

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER STUDENTS	AVERAGE PRE-TEST SCALE SCORE	AVERAGE POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	OBSERVED GAIN	EXPECTED POST-TEST SCALE SCORE	ACTUAL POST-TEST MINUS EXPECTED POST-TEST
*Spring 2	677	242	273	32	278	- 5
**Fall 2	77	235	273	38	255	+ 18 ***
Spring 3	718	268	302	34	309	- 7
Fall 3	114	256	299	43	278	+ 21 ***
Spring 4	694	287	326	39	318	+ 8
Fall 4	248	263	304	41	281	+ 23 ***
Spring 5	851	318	359	41	350	+ 9
Fall 5	390	287	328	41	306	+ 22 ***
Spring 6	1092	337	377	40	363	+ 14
Fall 6						
Spring 7	134	351	392	41	376	+ 16
Fall 7						
Spring 8	210	369	403	34	394	+ 9
Fall 8						
Spring 9	269	391	426	35	421	+ 5
Fall 9						
Spring 10	344	410	439	29	452	- 13
Fall 10						
Spring 11	103	417	451	34	435	+ 16
Fall 11						
Spring 12						
Fall 12						

*Spring indicates that the pre-test was given in the spring of the preceding year. Twelve months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

**Fall indicates that the pre-test was given in the fall. About eight months elapsed between the pre-test and the post-test.

***The difference is significant. Significance is based on the difference being equal to or greater than one-third of the grade-level scale-score standard deviation of the national standardization sample.

The entries in Table 5-5 are the grade equivalents and national percentile ranks of mean Title I post-test scores for CTBS and CAT Reading and Math for South Carolina grades 2-12. While the grade equivalents of these Title I students increase (with reversals in Reading at grade 9) through the grade levels, the percentile ranks (with several obvious reversals) show a dramatic tendency to decrease through the grade levels.

TABLE 5-5

COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS AND CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
GRADE EQUIVALENTS AND NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS
OF MEAN TITLE I POST-TEST SCORES FOR READING AND MATH
FOR S. C. GRADES 2-12

	CTBS-READING		CTBS-MATH		CAT-READING		CAT-MATH	
GRADE LEVELS	SGE	%-ile RANK	SGE	%-ile RANK	SGE	%-ile RANK	SGE	%-ile RANK
2	1.8	20	2.1	25	2.0	23	2.3	34
3	2.2	13	2.6	13	2.3	14	3.0	24
4	2.9	14	3.2	18	2.8	16	3.4	15
5	3.5	14	3.9	17	3.8	16	4.2	15
6	4.0	16	4.6	18	4.2	15	4.9	15
7	4.7	17	5.2	19	4.4	9	5.2	11
8	5.3	16	5.3	14	5.0	10	5.5	9
9	5.1	10	6.1	16	4.6	5	6.1	8
10	6.0	9	6.7	12	6.0	6	6.4	5
11	6.7	7	7.0	10	6.6	5	6.7	5
12	7.7	7	7.4	9	7.4	6		

Dropout Prevention

Although a cause-effect relationship is difficult, if not impossible to establish, dropout information is one indicator of improvement in school programs. The statewide dropout rate is continuing to decrease, a fact which may be due in part to the impact of Title I. A dropout is defined as "a pupil who leaves school for any reason except death before graduation or completion of a program and without transferring to another school."

As part of the Annual Title I Evaluation, data were collected from the LEAs on the dropout rate of participants in dropout prevention programs. No data are available from non-Title I schools or Title I schools which do not have dropout prevention programs.

As the data in Table 5-6 illustrate, the holding power of Title I dropout prevention programs is impressive. Although the reported dropout rate is higher than the state rate (1.2%), it should be remembered that these programs served only those students judged most likely to drop out of school.

TABLE 5-6

TITLE I DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING PROGRAMS	TOTAL NUMBER STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	NUMBER OF DROPOUTS	PERCENTAGE OF DROPOUTS
124	12,475	712	5.7%

VI. COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

The SEA has always encouraged LEAs to involve parents and the community in the planning and operation of programs in the public schools. Title I has further encouraged the participation of the community as a whole in the development of programs to meet the needs of the educationally deprived child. In an effort to further expand the involvement of parents in Title I programs, the SEA included in the State Title I Manual, the federal regulations concerning parental involvement. Additionally, the Title I project application requires an assurance from the LEA representative which includes the following: (1) that a system-wide council composed of parents of children to be served in public and non-public schools participating in Title I activities is established, and (2) that these parents represent the majority of such council. The form further provides assurance from the PAC representative that the council has been provided an opportunity to participate in planning, development and project operation.

The membership of PACs is summarized in Table 6-1. Note that this is a duplicated count.

The types of activities undertaken by the advisory councils are listed in Table 6-2. With two exceptions, the percentages of districts participating in various types of activities were virtually unchanged; more PACs are involved in program evaluation and fewer are involved in proposal development than during the previous year.

The State Department of Education is now in the process of organizing regional councils within the state. The councils will

consist of the chairman of each district in that region along with selected superintendents and coordinators.

In-service workshops will be conducted for the regional councils. The workshops will cover:

1. History and philosophy of Title I
2. Parental advisory councils' responsibilities
3. Target area selection
4. Program development
5. Program implementation
6. Dissemination
7. Evaluation

Packets will be developed for each district to be used in local in-service workshops.

TABLE 6-1

MEMBERSHIP OF PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

REPRESENTATION	% OF COUNCIL
Parents of public school participating students	74.9
Parents of non-public school participating students	.9
Parents of non-participating public school students	22.6
Parents of non-participating non-public school students	.2
Public school teaching staff	3
Non-public school teaching staff	1.6
Public school administration	2.1
Non-public school administration	1.3
Other: Businessmen, local community leaders, etc.	1.1

* Since some members are included in more than one area, percentage totals will exceed 100%.

TABLE 6-2

ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS PARTICIPATED

ACTIVITY	% OF DISTRICTS
Assist in the identification of students' needs	86
Participate in the development of proposals	84
Approve initial proposal	98
Act as a hearing committee for suggestions to improve the compensatory educational program	88
Participate in the implementing of the program	43
Aid in the evaluation of the program	67
Assist in publicizing the program	95
Solicit involvement from other parents	84
Other	3

VII. DISSEMINATION

During FY 1974, local districts utilized a variety of techniques in disseminating pertinent information to the local community, SEA and other agencies concerning the use of Title I funds. Probably the advisory councils' activities were the most significant means of dissemination. (See Table 6-2). Other techniques are summarized in Table 7-1. Staff meetings and in-service appear to be the most common ways of reaching staff members; while PTA meetings are most often used to reach laymen. The news media are not widely used.

TABLE 7-1

LEA TECHNIQUES USED IN DISSEMINATION
OF INFORMATION AND FREQUENCY OF USE

FY 1975

TECHNIQUES AND METHODS OF DISSEMINATING INFORMATION	NUMBER OF DISTRICTS USING THE TECHNIQUE
Presentation of information and data in staff meetings	90
News releases and feature stories in newspapers	79
In-service training (workshops, seminars, etc.) conducted for Title I staff	92
Newsletter to staff members	43
Presentation of information and data in public meetings and community groups	79
PTA meetings	61
Open House	57
Conducted tours	40
Presentation of information and data over the radio	32
Publications for local community distribution	30
Descriptive reports sent to Superintendents of Public Information	15
Brochures or pamphlets	19
Special radio coverage of the project	15
Presentation of information and data over television	4
Descriptive reports sent to other schools in the state	13
Publications for professional journals (for example, SCEA or NEA Magazines)	4
Special television coverage of project	3

VIII. TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING

LEAs that included teacher aides in their project proposals were required to show evidence of coordinated in-service training programs with joint participation of the educational aides and the professional staff members. In addition, the training offered had to be related to the specific duties and responsibilities of involved staff members and aides.

The general pattern of such activities consisted primarily of meetings two to three days prior to the opening of school, and scheduled meetings either weekly or monthly during the school term. Most of the school district's activities emphasized instructional material, equipment and techniques and the evaluation of instruction.

A total of $288,284.91 of Title I funds was spent on pre-service and in-service combined, an average of $3,133 per district. In addition, an estimated $713,750 was spent from other sources. This figure includes a portion of the salaries of non-Title I supervisors and consultants who conducted training sessions. (See Table 3-5).

IX. COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

During the school year of 1969-1970, the SEA made a concerted effort to enhance the participation of eligible non-public school children in the state. The major outgrowth of the effort made by the SEA was a revision of the assurances in Title I projects with regard to participation of eligible children in non-public schools, and proposed specific action to ensure improved assessment and adequate participation.

All districts in which eligible non-public schools are located have initiated a system of joint planning so that representatives of eligible non-public schools participate in the development of the Title I program. Participation of non-public school students in FY 1975 was 628. The majority of the non-public school programs were conducted during the regular school year on a regular time schedule.

X. STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE EFFORTS

During FY 1975, fourteen technical assistance workshops were conducted to inform the local administrative personnel involved in Title I of state and federal procedures germane to the successful and legal operation of their Title I programs. In addition to this effort, the Title I staff provided individual technical assistance to school districts upon request.

The workshops which were conducted during July 1974 to June 1975 are as follows:

1. December 3-5, 10-12, 1974. Six PAC Conferences to review Title I Parent Involvement Legislation.

2. September 27, 1975. Instructions for submitting Title I Tydings Amendments, Comparability Reports, and Handicapped 313 Reports.

3. April 7-8, 10-11, 14-15, 1975. Regional Conferences conducted throughout the state to explain Title I pre-submission requirements.

4. April-June, 1975. Individual Conferences scheduled for coordinators, curriculum specialists and evaluators of every district in order to review preliminary draft of FY 1976 proposal.

5. June 19, 1975. Conference to explain final application procedures for FY 1976 proposals and FY 1975 annual evaluation report.

The materials and procedures used in the workshops were developed specifically for use in these workshops. An evaluation of the materials showed that they were effective in imparting information. Many of the proposals reviewed during the pre-submission conferences (No. 4 above) were already in fundable form. This is further evidence of the effectiveness of the technical assistance efforts.